

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Examiner's Advisory Office Action of July 31, 2006 the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Request for Continued Examination and Amendment to the claims, and the below Remarks.

#### ***Regarding Amendment***

In the Amendment:

independent claim 1 is amended to clarify that the claimed printhead assembly is an assembly of a plurality of separable individual parts, where these parts include the listed claimed elements. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at page 2, lines 21-26 and page 6, lines 19-26 of the present specification; and

dependent claims 2-7 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the Amendment does not introduce any new matter into the present application.

#### ***Regarding Continuation of 11 in the Advisory Office Action***

##### ***Regarding Applicant's Argument***

In the Continuation Sheet of the Advisory Office Action, the Examiner asserts that "Applicant's argument that the casing and drive electronics must be separate from the printhead assembly is not contained in the claims".

Firstly, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicant argued in the Reply to the final Office Action, that the claimed casing and drive electronics are separate from the claimed printhead module, not the claimed printhead assembly as asserted by the Examiner. It is noted that reference to "printhead assembly 10" in the Applicant's arguments was to element 10 of Silverbrook in the context of the Examiner equating element 10 of Silverbrook to a printhead "module".

Secondly, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion (assuming that the Examiner intended to state printhead "module"), because the claimed invention is clearly directed to a printhead "assembly", and one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the separately listed claim elements (i.e., the elements separated by the semi-colons in pending independent claim 1) are separate parts of that "assembly". Furthermore, pending independent claim 1 clearly recites that the casing mounts the drive electronics and incorporates a clamping arrangement which removably clamps the at least one printhead module to the casing, and as such it is clear that the drive electronics, casing and printhead module are separate parts which are assembled together.

Finally, having said the above, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to explicitly recite the separate and individual parts of the assembly, including the drive electronics part, the casing part and the printhead module part. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-7 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by Silverbrook for at least the above reasons and those submitted by the Applicant in the Reply to the final Office Action.

*Regarding Proposed Amendment*

In the Continuation Sheet of the Advisory Office Action, the Examiner refers to "the proposed amendment" and asserts that it raises new issues/limitations ... such as "removably clamping". However, this "proposed amendment" was submitted with the Applicant's Reply to the Office Action previous to the final Office Action, and was apparently considered by the Examiner in the final Office Action.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK



---

NORMAN MICHEAL BERRY



---

GARRY RAYMOND JACKSON



---

AKIRA NAKAZAWA

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762